



**Causeway  
Coast & Glens  
Borough Council**

**SITE VISIT REPORT: Monday 21<sup>st</sup> October 2024**

*Committee Members: Alderman, Boyle, Callan, Coyle, Hunter (Chair), Scott, Stewart, S McKillop and; Councillors Anderson, C Archibald, Kennedy, McGurk, McMullan, Nicholl, Peacock, Storey and Watton(Vice Chair)*

**LA01/2023/1165/F 25 Peters Road, Drumsurn, BT47 4QZ**

**App Type: Full**

**Proposal: Provision of 3no. self contained Holiday Pods, car parking & ancillary enhanced landscaping to the east of and adjacent to the existing dwelling at 25 Peters Road, Drumsurn.**

**Present: Ald Hunter, Coyle, Councillors, Archibald, Watton**

**Officials: J Lundy M McErlain**

**Comments:** The site visit commenced from within the existing residential curtilage of No. 25. The Official directed members to the proposed location of the pods to the rear of the existing dwelling and garage (No. 25).

The official advised that due to the size of the pods proposed they did not fall within the definition of a caravan and as such they fell within the scope of self-catering accommodation and fall to be considered against Policy TSM5 of PPS16 (Self Catering Accommodation in the Countryside), and in particular Criteria B, and that Criteria B of the Policy requires that new units of self-catering accommodation are required to be sited at or close to an existing tourist amenity.

The official outlined that the applicant/agent had identified a number of tourism attractions within the wider vicinity of the application site but that the majority did not meet with the definition of a tourist amenity, and that they fell within the definition of a tourism asset. The official clarified the difference between a tourist amenity and a tourism asset as set out within PPS16.

The official outlined that the closest identified tourism amenity was the Roe Valley Country Park Visitor Centre/Café which was over 9km from the

application site and was therefore not regarded as being at or close to the tourist amenity.

Cllr Archibald referenced Garvagh Museum as a tourist amenity. The official advised that given the distance to the museum from the application site it would not be considered to be located at or close to an existing Tourist amenity.

The official confirmed that Policy TSM 5 requires proposals to be ancillary to the primary tourism use of the site, which the proposal is not and as such the proposal fails to meet with the policy requirements of TSM5.

Cllr Watton asked if there were any agricultural lands associated with the dwelling. The official clarified that there were none. This issue was queried during the processing of the application.

The official outlined that integration was not of significant concern given the limited public views, however additional landscaping would be required to be provided to the site boundaries which are defined only by post and wire fencing.

The site visit was concluded.

Martin McErlain

22.10.24